arXiv:1611.09586v1 [quant-ph] 29 Nov 2016

Volume of the set of locally diagonalizable bipartite states

Lin Zhang[1]*, Seunghun Hong[2]†

[1]*Institute of Mathematics, Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou 310018, PR China*

[2]*Northwestern College, 101 7th St SW, Orange City, 51041 IA, USA*

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to investigate the geometry of the set of locally diagonalizable bipartite quantum states. Instead of characterizing which bipartite quantum states may be locally diagonalizable except the two-qubit situation, we calculate the Hilbert-Schmidt volume of all locally diagonalizable bipartite quantum states. Besides, we partition the set of all locally diagonalizable states as local unitary orbits (or co-adjoint orbits) of diagonal forms. It is well-known that the Riemannian volume of a co-adjoint orbit for a regular point in a specified Weyl chamber can be calculated exactly by Harish-Chandra's volume formula. By modifying Harish-Chandra's volume formula, we firstly give a specific formula for the Riemannian volume of a co-adjoint local unitary orbit of a regular point in a specified Weyl chamber. Several open questions are presented as well.

Keywords: Euclid volume; Hilbert-Schmidt measure; Harish-Chandra's volume formula; local unitary orbit

1 Introduction

Qubits and qubit quantum channels are the simplest building blocks for quantum information processing and quantum computations. A qubit is the quantum analog of the classical bit; a qubit quantum channel is just the quantum analog of the transition probability matrix. Recently, Lovas and Andai [11] analyze the structure of these qubit channels by duality between quantum maps and quantum states, i.e., via Choi-Jamiłkowski correspondence [19]. They give a calculation about the (Euclid) volume of general and unital qubit channels (real and complex case) with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For unital qubit channels, they are essential equivalent to two-qubit states with the same marginal states–completely mixed states via Choi-Jamiłkowski representation.

In the recent decades, the geometric separability probability of bipartite systems, i.e., the ratio of volumes of the set of separable bipartite states to the set of all bipartite states on the same tensor space of two Hilbert spaces, has been extensively studied. In 1998, Życzkowski *et al.* raised this question and

*E-mail: godyalin@163.com; linyz@zju.edu.cn

†E-mail: seunghun.hong@nwciowa.edu

gave a detailed discussion about it [18]. In order to solve this problem, as suggested by the definition of separability probability, we must calculate two volumes: (1) the volume of the set of all states acting on the same Hilbert space; (2) the volume of the set of all separable states acting on the bipartite Hilbert spaces. Luckily, the volume of the set of all states with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt measure was computed by Życzkowski [21] and Andai [1]. Later a detailed reasoning for such volume formula was reviewed by Zhang [17]. One of the simplest but very difficult problem is to compute the separability probability of two-qubit quantum states with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt measure. Numerical simulations leads an intriguing formula for separability probability, presented in 2013 by Slater [16]: the separability probability for *real* two-qubit state is $\frac{\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}^{\mathrm{sep}}\left(\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\otimes\mathbb{R}^2\right)\right)}{\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}(\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{R}^2\otimes\mathbb{R}^2))}=\frac{29}{64}$ and for *complex* two-qubit is $\frac{\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}^{\mathrm{sep}}\left(\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2\right)\right)}{\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}(\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2))}=\frac{8}{33}$, where $\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{K}^m\otimes\mathbb{K}^n\right)$ stands for the set of all bipartite density matrices acting on $\mathbb{K}^m\otimes\mathbb{K}^n$. Here $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Now the separability probability for *real* two-qubit state being $\frac{29}{64}$ has been proved by Lovas and Andai [12]. But the separability probability for *complex* two-qubit being $\frac{8}{33}$ is still open at present.

The purpose of this article is to infer some information about the set of bipartite quantum states which may be locally diagonalizable. Instead of characterizing which bipartite qudits may be locally diagonalizable, we calculate the volume of all bipartite quantum states that are locally unitary equivalent to some diagonal matrix. It is well-known that the volume of a co-adjoint orbit for a regular point in a specified Weyl chamber can be calculated exactly by Harish-Chandra's volume formula. By modifying Harish-Chandra's volume formula, we firstly give a specific formula for the volume of a co-adjoint local unitary orbit of a regular point in a specified Weyl chamber. As an application, we calculate the volume of the set of all bipartite quantum states that are locally unitary equivalent to some diagonal quantum states.

The paper is organized as follows. After introducing basic notions used in the present paper, in Sect. 2, we give a derivation of joint probability distribution density of all eigenvalues of all locally diagonalizable bipartite states. At this section, we present a necessary and sufficient condition for two-qubit being locally unitary (LU) equivalent to a given diagonal form. Sequentially, we prove one of our main results (Theorem 2.6). In Sect. 3, we present demonstration of Harish-Chandra's volume formula in the explicit case such as unitary group and the tensor product of two unitary groups. First main result (Theorem 3.5) in this section lead to the analytical formula of the volume of tensor product of two unitary groups. Subsequently, such formula is applied to study the local unitary orbit of a diagonal form. The second main result (Theorem 3.8) in this section leads to a conclusion that the volume of locally co-adjoint orbits of tensor product is exactly the product of volumes. We conclude Sect. 4 with discussion and several open problems.

2 Volume of the set of all locally diagonalizable states

Suppose that we are given two finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$. Specifically, let $\mathcal{H}=\mathbb{C}^m$ and $\mathcal{K}=\mathbb{C}^n$. Chose the standard basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$ for $\mathbb{C}^m$ and $\mathbb{C}^n$, respectively. A qudit is represented by a positive semi-definite matrices of unit trace. Denote by $\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^k\right)$ the set of all $k\times k$ density matrices. By this, a bipartite qudit is represented by a density matrices in $\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^m\otimes\mathbb{C}^n\right)$. Throughout this paper, we do not distinguish the meaning of a state and a density matrix. That is, we view both as the same thing. A bipartite state ρ_{AB} is *separable* if it can be written as a probabilistic mixture of product states $\rho_\mu^A\otimes\rho_\mu^B$,

where $\rho_\mu^A \in \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^m)$ and $\rho_\mu^B \in \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^n)$, i.e.,

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_\mu p_\mu \rho_\mu^A \otimes \rho_\mu^B. \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\{p_\mu\}_\mu$ is a probability distribution. A bipartite state is called *entangled* if it cannot be written as a probabilistic mixture of product states. It is well-known that each Hermitian matrix can be diagonalized by the adjoint action of a unitary matrix via Spectral Decomposition Theorem. In view of this, we see that a bipartite state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$ can be diagonalized by some global unitary matrix $U \in \mathrm{U}(mn)$, the unitary group consisting of all unitary matrices on $\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$. That is,

$$\rho_{AB} = U\Lambda U^\dagger, \quad \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle ij|, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\dagger$ denotes the adjoint. Note that all eigenvalues λ_{ij} of ρ_{AB} are indexed by two indices.

A bipartite state ρ_{AB} is said to be *locally diagonalizable* if it can be brought to be the diagonal form

$$\rho_{AB} = (U_A \otimes U_B)\Lambda(U_A \otimes U_B)^\dagger, \quad (U_A \in \mathrm{U}(m), U_B \in \mathrm{U}(n)). \tag{2.3}$$

Here we can require that $U_A \in \mathrm{SU}(m), U_B \in \mathrm{SU}(n)$. Denote the set of all locally diagonalizable bipartite states from $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$ by the following notation

$$\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n) := \{\rho \in \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n) : \rho \text{ is locally diagonalizable}\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Whether a bipartite state is locally diagonalizable is intimately related to the question of the so-called local unitary equivalence. Let ρ and ρ' be two bipartite states in $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$. They are called *locally unitary equivalent* (abbr. LU) if

$$\rho' = (U \otimes V)\rho(U \otimes V)^\dagger \tag{2.5}$$

for some unitary matrices $U \in \mathrm{SU}(m)$ and $V \in \mathrm{SU}(n)$. Thus in (2.3), ρ_{AB} is LU equivalent to the diagonal form Λ. Clearly, not every bipartite state can be locally diagonalizable, even so for separable states. A simple dimension counting may account for the reason [2]. It is easily seen that $\dim(\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)) = (mn)^2 - 1$. We can identify the submanifold $\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$ with $(\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n))/(T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}) \times \Delta_{mn-1}$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n) &\simeq (\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n))/(T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}) \times \Delta_{mn-1} &(2.6)\\ &\simeq (\mathrm{U}(m)/T_{(m)}) \otimes (\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}) \times \Delta_{mn-1}, &(2.7) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_{k-1} = \left\{(p_1, \ldots, p_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k : \sum_{j=1}^k p_j = 1\right\}$ denotes the $(k-1)$-dimensional probability simplex. Also, $T_{(m)}$ and $T_{(n)}$ denote the maximal tori of Lie groups $\mathrm{U}(m)$ and $\mathrm{U}(n)$, respectively. More on this in Sect. 3. Therefore

$$\dim(\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)) = (m^2 - 1) + (n^2 - 1) + (m-1)(n-1). \tag{2.8}$$

Besides, the set of all product mixed states forms a $(m^2 + n^2 - 2)$-dimensional subset of the whole state space.

Lemma 2.1. *The joint probability density of eigenvalues of all locally diagonalizable bipartite states from* $\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$ *is given by*

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda) \propto \left[\prod_{1\leqslant i<i'\leqslant m}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right]\left[\prod_{1\leqslant j<j'\leqslant n}\sum_{i=1}^{m}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})^2\right][\mathrm{d}\Lambda], \tag{2.9}$$

where $[\mathrm{d}\Lambda] := \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{ij}$ *is the Lebesgue volume element for the diagonal matrix* Λ *mentioned in* (2.2).

Proof. Let $\rho \in \mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$. Then it must be of the form: $\rho = (U\otimes V)\Lambda(U\otimes V)^\dagger$ for $U \in \mathrm{U}(m)/T_{(m)}$ and $V \in \mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}$. Thus

$$\mathrm{d}\rho = (U\otimes V)\left(\mathrm{d}\Lambda + [\mathrm{d}G, \Lambda]\right)(U\otimes V)^\dagger. \tag{2.10}$$

Here $\mathrm{d}G = (U\otimes V)^\dagger \mathrm{d}(U\otimes V) = \mathrm{d}G_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathrm{d}G_2$, where $\mathrm{d}G_1 = U^\dagger \mathrm{d}U$ and $\mathrm{d}G_2 = V^\dagger \mathrm{d}V$. It suffices to identify the volume element generated by $[\mathrm{d}G, \Lambda]$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathrm{d}\rho, \mathrm{d}\rho\rangle &= \langle \mathrm{d}\Lambda + [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda], \mathrm{d}\Lambda + [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\rangle \\
&= \langle \mathrm{d}\Lambda, \mathrm{d}\Lambda\rangle + \langle \mathrm{d}\Lambda, [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\rangle + \langle [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda], \mathrm{d}\Lambda\rangle + \langle [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda], [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\rangle \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathrm{d}\Lambda^2\right) + \mathrm{Tr}\left([\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]^\dagger [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left([\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]^\dagger [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\right) = 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Lambda \mathrm{d}G \Lambda \mathrm{d}G\right) - 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Lambda^2 \mathrm{d}G^2\right).$$

If $\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\lambda_{ij}|ij\rangle\langle ij|$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tr}\left([\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]^\dagger [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\right) = 2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}\lambda_{i'j'}\langle ij|\mathrm{d}G|i'j'\rangle\langle i'j'|\mathrm{d}G|ij\rangle - 2\sum_{i,j}\lambda_{ij}^2\left\langle ij\left|\mathrm{d}G^2\right|ij\right\rangle \\
&= -2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}\lambda_{i'j'}\left|\langle ij|\mathrm{d}G|i'j'\rangle\right|^2 - 2\sum_{i,j}\lambda_{ij}^2\left\langle ij\left|\mathrm{d}G^2\right|ij\right\rangle \\
&= 2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}^2\left|\langle ij|\mathrm{d}G|i'j'\rangle\right|^2 - 2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}\lambda_{i'j'}\left|\langle ij|\mathrm{d}G|i'j'\rangle\right|^2 \\
&= 2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j'})\left|\langle ij|\mathrm{d}G|i'j'\rangle\right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\langle ij|\mathrm{d}G|i'j'\rangle\right|^2 &= \left(\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\langle j|j'\rangle + \langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\langle i|i'\rangle\right)\left(\overline{\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\langle j|j'\rangle} + \overline{\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\langle i|i'\rangle}\right) \\
&= \left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2\delta_{jj'} + \left|\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\right|^2\delta_{ii'} \\
&\quad + \langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\overline{\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle}\delta_{ii'}\delta_{jj'} + \overline{\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle}\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\delta_{ii'}\delta_{jj'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}\left([\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]^\dagger [\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\right) &= 2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j'})\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2\delta_{jj'} \\
&\quad +2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j'})\left|\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\right|^2\delta_{ii'} \\
&\quad +2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j'})\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\overline{\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle}\delta_{ii'}\delta_{jj'} \\
&\quad +2\sum_{i,j}\sum_{i',j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j'})\overline{\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle}\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\delta_{ii'}\delta_{jj'}.
\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\left([\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]^{\dagger}[\mathrm{d}G,\Lambda]\right) &= 2\sum_{i',i,j}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2 \\ &\quad +2\sum_{i,j,j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})\left|\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle|^2 = |\langle i'|\mathrm{d}G_1|i\rangle|^2$ (both vanishes if $i=i'$ because $\mathrm{d}G_1$ is skew-Hermitian), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i'\neq i}\left[\sum_j\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})\right]\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2 \\ &=\sum_{i<i'}\left[\sum_j\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})\right]\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2+\sum_{i>i'}\left[\sum_j\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})\right]\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2 \\ &=\sum_{i<i'}\left[\sum_j\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})+\sum_j\lambda_{i'j}(\lambda_{i'j}-\lambda_{ij})\right]\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2 \\ &=\sum_{i<i'}\left[\sum_j(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right]\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\mathrm{d}\rho,\mathrm{d}\rho\rangle &= \sum_{i,j}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{ij}^2+2\sum_{i'\neq i,j}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2+2\sum_{i,j\neq j'}\lambda_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})\left|\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\right|^2 \\ &=\sum_{i,j}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{ij}^2+2\sum_{i<i'}\left(\sum_j(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right)\left|\langle i|\mathrm{d}G_1|i'\rangle\right|^2+2\sum_{j<j'}\left(\sum_i(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})^2\right)\left|\langle j|\mathrm{d}G_2|j'\rangle\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

The Hilbert-Schmidt volume element is given by

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathrm{d}\rho] &= \prod_{i<i'}2\left[\sum_j(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right]\prod_{j<j'}2\left[\sum_i(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})^2\right][\mathrm{d}\Lambda][\mathrm{d}G_1][\mathrm{d}G_2] \\ &=2^{\binom{m}{2}+\binom{n}{2}}\left[\prod_{i<i'}\sum_j(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right]\left[\prod_{j<j'}\sum_i(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})^2\right][\mathrm{d}\Lambda][\mathrm{d}G_1][\mathrm{d}G_2].\end{aligned}$$

By integrating out $[\mathrm{d}G_1][\mathrm{d}G_2]$, we get the desired result. □

Remark 2.2. We make some remarks here: the Lebesgue volume element $[\mathrm{d}G_1]$ is defined on the flag manifold $\mathrm{U}(m)/T_{(m)}$, where we endow the quotient space with the quotient measure. Similarly, $[\mathrm{d}G_2]$ is defined on the flag manifold $\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}$. They can be described in terms of Haar measure defined over Lie groups $\mathrm{U}(m)$ and $\mathrm{U}(n)$. Specifically,

$$[\mathrm{d}G_1]=\frac{\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(m))}{\mathrm{vol}(T_{(m)})}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathrm{Haar}}(U),\quad [\mathrm{d}G_2]=\frac{\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(n))}{\mathrm{vol}(T_{(n)})}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathrm{Haar}}(V),\quad U\in\mathrm{U}(m),V\in\mathrm{U}(n). \tag{2.11}$$

By such interpretation, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathrm{d}\rho] &= \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(m))\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(n))\frac{2^{\binom{m}{2}+\binom{n}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{m+n}} \\ &\quad\times\left[\prod_{i<i'}\sum_j(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right]\left[\prod_{j<j'}\sum_i(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})^2\right][\mathrm{d}\Lambda]\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathrm{Haar}}(U)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathrm{Haar}}(V).\end{aligned}$$

In most cases of this paper, we will focus on two-qubit situation since relevant analytical computations to two-qubit case can be performed. Let us recall the notion of the Bloch sphere representation. In quantum mechanics, the Bloch sphere is a geometrical representation of the pure state space of a two-level quantum mechanical system (qubit). Any qubit state can be represented by Pauli matrices:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + \mathbf{r}(\rho) \cdot \sigma), \quad \mathbf{r}(\rho) \in \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{2.12}$$

Here the vector $\mathbf{r}(\rho)$ is called the Bloch vector of ρ and is restricted to have $\|\mathbf{r}(\rho)\| := \sqrt{r_x^2 + r_y^2 + r_z^2} \leqslant 1$. Here $\sigma = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ is the vector of Pauli's matrices where

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{i} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.13}$$

with properties

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_x\sigma_y &= -\sigma_y\sigma_x = \mathrm{i}\sigma_z, \\ \sigma_y\sigma_z &= -\sigma_z\sigma_y = \mathrm{i}\sigma_x, \\ \sigma_z\sigma_x &= -\sigma_x\sigma_z = \mathrm{i}\sigma_y. \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

It also holds that communication relations

$$\begin{cases} [\sigma_x, \sigma_y] &= 2\mathrm{i}\sigma_z, \\ [\sigma_y, \sigma_z] &= 2\mathrm{i}\sigma_x, \\ [\sigma_z, \sigma_x] &= 2\mathrm{i}\sigma_y, \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

and anti-communication relations

$$\{\sigma_i, \sigma_j\} = \sigma_i\sigma_j + \sigma_j\sigma_i = 0 \ (i \neq j). \tag{2.16}$$

Moreover $\sigma_k^2 = \mathbb{1}$ for each $k = x, y, z$. For $U \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$, there corresponds $O \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ such that

$$\mathbf{r}(U\rho U^\dagger) = O\mathbf{r}(\rho). \tag{2.17}$$

This means that the adjoint action of a unitary matrix $U \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$ on a qubit state ρ amounts to a rotation of the corresponding Bloch vector of ρ. With this Bloch sphere representation of a qubit, we have that any two-qubit state can be written as

$$\rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{4}\left(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{r} \cdot \sigma \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbf{s} \cdot \sigma + \sum_{i,j=x,y,z} t_{ij}\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j\right). \tag{2.18}$$

From this, any two-qubit is given by the 3-dimensional real column vectors $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and the real 3×3 matrix $T = (t_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$. Now both two-qubit states ρ_{AB} and ρ'_{AB} are locally unitary (LU) equivalent, i.e., $\rho'_{AB} = (U_A \otimes U_B)\rho_{AB}(U_A \otimes U_B)^\dagger$ for some $U_A, U_B \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$, if and only if there are $O_A, O_B \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ such that

$$\mathbf{r}' = O_A\mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{s}' = O_B\mathbf{s}, \tag{2.19}$$

$$T' = O_A T O_B^\mathsf{T}. \tag{2.20}$$

Theorem 2.3 ([10]). *Two generic two-qubit states are LU equivalent if and only if they have the same values for the following 12 invariants: for $k = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\left\langle \mathbf{r} \middle| \left(TT^{\mathsf{T}}\right)^k \middle| \mathbf{r} \right\rangle, \quad \left\langle \mathbf{s} \middle| \left(T^{\mathsf{T}}T\right)^k \middle| \mathbf{s} \right\rangle, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\left\langle \mathbf{r} \middle| \left(TT^{\mathsf{T}}\right)^k T \middle| \mathbf{s} \right\rangle, \quad \mathrm{Tr}\left(\left[TT^{\mathsf{T}}\right]^{k+1}\right). \tag{2.22}$$

In order to answer which two-qubits are locally diagonalizable, we need the notion of X-states: the density matrix of a two-qubit X-state is of the general form:

$$\rho_X := \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{14} \\ 0 & \rho_{22} & \rho_{23} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{32} & \rho_{33} & 0 \\ \rho_{41} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{44} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.23}$$

This expression describes a quantum state, $\rho_X \in \mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2\right)$, provided the unit trace and positivity conditions:

(i) $\sum_{j=1}^{4} \rho_{jj} = 1$

(ii) $\rho_{22}\rho_{33} \geqslant |\rho_{23}|^2$ and $\rho_{11}\rho_{44} \geqslant |\rho_{14}|^2$

We denote $\mathscr{D}_X(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ the set of all two-qubit X-states. Apparently $\mathscr{D}_X(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ is the 7-dimensional submanifold of $\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2\right)$. So is $\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$. Note that the Hilbert-Schmidt volume of the set of all two-qubit X-states is calculated in [14]: $\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}\left(\mathscr{D}_X(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)\right) = \frac{\pi^2}{630}$ [1].

Proposition 2.4. *If a two-qubit state ρ_{AB} is an X-state (2.23), then it can be written as*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} &= \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + a_z\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{1} + b_z\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_z + r_{xx}\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \\ &\quad + r_{xy}\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y + r_{yx}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x + r_{yy}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y + r_{zz}\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z), \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a_z &= \rho_{11} - \rho_{22} + \rho_{33} - \rho_{44}, \\ b_z &= \rho_{11} + \rho_{22} - \rho_{33} - \rho_{44}, \\ r_{zz} &= \rho_{11} - \rho_{22} - \rho_{33} + \rho_{44}, \end{cases} \quad \textit{and} \quad \begin{cases} r_{xx} &= \rho_{14} + \rho_{23} + \rho_{32} + \rho_{41}, \\ r_{xy} &= \mathrm{i}(\rho_{14} + \rho_{23} - \rho_{32} - \rho_{41}), \\ r_{yx} &= \mathrm{i}(\rho_{14} - \rho_{23} + \rho_{32} - \rho_{41}), \\ r_{yy} &= -\rho_{14} + \rho_{23} + \rho_{32} - \rho_{41}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover all eigenvalues of such state are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2}(\rho_X) = \frac{1}{4}\left((1 + r_{zz}) \pm \sqrt{(a_z + b_z)^2 + (r_{xx} - r_{yy})^2 + (r_{xy} + r_{yx})^2}\right), \tag{2.25}$$

$$\lambda_{3,4}(\rho_X) = \frac{1}{4}\left((1 - r_{zz}) \pm \sqrt{(a_z - b_z)^2 + (r_{xx} + r_{yy})^2 + (r_{xy} - r_{yx})^2}\right). \tag{2.26}$$

[1] This fraction is a correction to the result of Milz and Strunz [14]; they misused a factor leading to an incorrect Hilbert-Schmidt volume of $\frac{\pi^2}{5040}$. But their calculation of the Euclid volume of X-states is correct.

By using this result, we have that, for $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$,

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + a_z \sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{1} + b_z \mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_z + r_{zz} \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z), \tag{2.27}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a_z = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \\ b_z = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \\ r_{zz} = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \end{cases}. \tag{2.28}$$

Then $\mathbf{r}(\Lambda) = a_z|3\rangle, \mathbf{s}(\Lambda) = b_z|3\rangle$, and $T(\Lambda) = r_{zz}|3\rangle\langle 3|$, where $|3\rangle := (0,0,1)^{\mathsf{T}}$. If ρ is LU equivalent to the diagonal form Λ, then we have the following statement.

Theorem 2.5. *A generic two-qubit state ρ is locally diagonalizable if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$\mathbf{r} = a_z O_A|3\rangle, \quad \mathbf{s} = b_z O_B|3\rangle, \quad T = r_{zz} O_A|3\rangle\langle 3|O_B^{\mathsf{T}}, \tag{2.29}$$

where $O_A, O_B \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$; and the triple (a_z, b_z, r_{zz}) is given by (2.28).

Theorem 2.6. *The Hilbert-Schmidt volume of $\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ is given by*

$$\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}\left(\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)\right) = \frac{(2\pi)^2}{105}. \tag{2.30}$$

Proof. For any generic two-qubit density matrices $\rho \in \mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$, it can be parameterized as follows:

$$\rho = (U \otimes V)\Lambda(U \otimes V)^{\dagger}, \tag{2.31}$$

where $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ with λ_j's being pairwise different and $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho))[\mathrm{d}\rho] &= 4\delta\left(1 - \sum_j \lambda_j\right) && (2.32) \\ &\quad \times \left[(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_4)^2\right]\left[(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)^2 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)^2\right][\mathrm{d}\Lambda] && (2.33) \\ &\quad \times \frac{[\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(2))]^2}{(2\pi)^4}\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathrm{Haar}}(U)\mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathrm{Haar}}(V). && (2.34) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)} \delta(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho))[\mathrm{d}\rho] \\ &= \frac{4[\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(2))]^2}{(2\pi)^4}\int \delta\left(1 - \sum_j \lambda_j\right)\left[(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_4)^2\right]\left[(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)^2 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)^2\right][\mathrm{d}\Lambda]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that [17]

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(k)) = \frac{2^k \pi^{\binom{k+1}{2}}}{\prod_{j=1}^k \Gamma(j)}. \tag{2.35}$$

Then $\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(2)) = 4\pi^3$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}\left(\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2)\right) = \int_{\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2)} \delta(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho))[\mathrm{d}\rho] \tag{2.36}$$

$$= 4\pi^2 \int \delta\left(1-\sum_j \lambda_j\right)\left[(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2+(\lambda_3-\lambda_4)^2\right]\left[(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2+(\lambda_2-\lambda_4)^2\right]\prod_{j=1}^4 \mathrm{d}\lambda_j. \tag{2.37}$$

Next we will calculate the above last integral. Clearly we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2+(\lambda_3-\lambda_4)^2\right]\left[(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2+(\lambda_2-\lambda_4)^2\right]\\ &= (\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2+(\lambda_3-\lambda_1)^2(\lambda_3-\lambda_4)^2+(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)^2(\lambda_2-\lambda_4)^2+(\lambda_4-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_4-\lambda_3)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Then the following four integrals are equal:

$$\int \delta\left(1-\sum_j \lambda_j\right)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^4 \mathrm{d}\lambda_j,$$

$$\int \delta\left(1-\sum_j \lambda_j\right)(\lambda_3-\lambda_1)^2(\lambda_3-\lambda_4)^2\prod_{j=1}^4 \mathrm{d}\lambda_j,$$

$$\int \delta\left(1-\sum_j \lambda_j\right)(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)^2(\lambda_2-\lambda_4)^2\prod_{j=1}^4 \mathrm{d}\lambda_j,$$

$$\int \delta\left(1-\sum_j \lambda_j\right)(\lambda_4-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_4-\lambda_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^4 \mathrm{d}\lambda_j.$$

Denote

$$f(t) = \int \delta\left(t-\sum_j \lambda_j\right)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^4 \mathrm{d}\lambda_j. \tag{2.38}$$

Performing Laplace transform $(t\to s)$ to $f(t)$, we get $\widetilde{f}(s)(s>0)$:

$$\widetilde{f}(s) = \mathscr{L}(f)(s) = \int_0^\infty f(t)e^{-st}\mathrm{d}t \tag{2.39}$$

$$= \int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\left[\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t e^{-st}\delta\left(t-\sum_j\lambda_j\right)\right](\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^4\mathrm{d}\lambda_j. \tag{2.40}$$

$$= \int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty \exp\left(-s\sum_j\lambda_j\right)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^4\mathrm{d}\lambda_j. \tag{2.41}$$

That is,

$$\widetilde{f}(s) = s^{-8}\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^4 x_j\right)(x_1-x_2)^2(x_1-x_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^4\mathrm{d}x_j \tag{2.42}$$

$$= s^{-8}\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^3 x_j\right)(x_1-x_2)^2(x_1-x_3)^2\prod_{j=1}^3\mathrm{d}x_j. \tag{2.43}$$

Since

$$(x_1-x_2)^2(x_1-x_3)^2 = x_1^4-2(x_2+x_3)x_1^3+(x_2^2+x_3^2+4x_2x_3)x_1^2-2x_2x_3(x_2+x_3)x_1+x_2^2x_3^2$$

and

$$\Gamma(n)=\int_0^\infty x^{n-1}e^{-x}\mathrm{d}x,\quad n\in\mathbb{N},$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}x_1e^{-x_1}(x_1-x_2)^2(x_1-x_3)^2\\&=\Gamma(5)-2(x_2+x_3)\Gamma(4)+(x_2^2+x_3^2+4x_2x_3)\Gamma(3)-2x_2x_3(x_2+x_3)\Gamma(2)+x_2^2x_3^2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\mathrm{d}x_3e^{-x_1}e^{-x_2}e^{-x_3}(x_1-x_2)^2(x_1-x_3)^2\\&=\Gamma(5)-2[\Gamma(2)+\Gamma(2)]\Gamma(4)+[\Gamma(3)+\Gamma(3)+4\Gamma(2)\Gamma(2)]\Gamma(3)\\&\quad-2[\Gamma(3)\Gamma(2)+\Gamma(2)\Gamma(3)]\Gamma(2)+\Gamma(3)\Gamma(3)\\&=12.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\widetilde{f}(s)=12\cdot s^{-8}. \tag{2.44}$$

Based on this fact, we get that

$$f(t)=\mathscr{L}^{-1}(\widetilde{f})(t)=12\cdot\frac{t^7}{7!}=\frac{1}{420}t^7. \tag{2.45}$$

Finally, we can draw our conclusion as follows:

$$\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}\left(\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2)\right)=4\pi^2\cdot 4f(1)=\frac{(2\pi)^2}{105}. \tag{2.46}$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 2.7. By the reasoning method used in the proof of Theorem 2.6, we can generalize the volume formula for two-qubit case to arbitrary bipartite state case. Specifically, we have

$$\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}\left(\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m\otimes\mathbb{C}^n)\right)=\int_{\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m\otimes\mathbb{C}^n)}\delta(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho))[\mathrm{d}\rho] \tag{2.47}$$

$$=\frac{(2\pi)^{\binom{m}{2}+\binom{n}{2}}}{\prod_{i=1}^m\Gamma(i)\prod_{j=1}^n\Gamma(j)}\int\delta\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^m\sum_{j=1}^n\lambda_{ij}\right) \tag{2.48}$$

$$\times\left(\prod_{1\leqslant i<i'\leqslant m}\sum_{j=1}^n(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{i'j})^2\right)\left(\prod_{1\leqslant j<j'\leqslant n}\sum_{i=1}^m(\lambda_{ij}-\lambda_{ij'})^2\right)\prod_{i=1}^m\prod_{j=1}^n\mathrm{d}\lambda_{ij}. \tag{2.49}$$

Theoretically, we can write down the volume formula. But, however, such expression for this volume formula will be rather complicated.

3 Harish-Chandra's volume formula

Let $\mathrm{U}(m)$ be the unitary group acting on $\mathbb{C}^m$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(m)$. Denote by $T_{(m)}$ the maximal torus of $\mathrm{U}(m)$, and $\mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \cong \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{R}^m$ is its Lie algebra. Without loss of generality, we take $\mathfrak{t}_{(m)}$ as the set of diagonal matrices with purely imaginary diagonal entries. Let $K = \mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)$. Then its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ may be described as

$$\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{u}(m) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n). \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of the maximal torus $T = T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}$ of K may also described as, in terms of $\mathfrak{t}_{(m)}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_{(n)}$,

$$\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n)}. \tag{3.2}$$

It is a routine exercise to see that $\dim(\mathfrak{t}) = \dim(\mathfrak{t}_{(m)}) + \dim(\mathfrak{t}_{(n)}) - 1 = m + n - 1$. We shall see that (Proposition 3.4) $\dim(\mathfrak{k}) = \dim(\mathfrak{u}(m)) + \dim(\mathfrak{u}(n)) - 1 = m^2 + n^2 - 1$. We also have

$$[\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)]/[T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}] \simeq [\mathrm{U}(m)/T_{(m)}] \otimes [\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}]. \tag{3.3}$$

It goes without saying that, for volumes of quotient spaces, we shall use quotient measures.

Proposition 3.1 (Harish-Chandra's volume formula, [3, 6])**.** *Let K be a compact, connected Lie group. Let T be the maximal torus of K. The Riemannian volume of the flag manifold K/T is given by*

$$\mathrm{vol}(K/T) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}^+} \frac{2\pi}{\langle \alpha, \varpi \rangle}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}^+$ is the set of all positive roots for $\mathfrak{k}$ and $\varpi := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}^+} \alpha$, which is Weyl vector, i.e., a half the sum of all positive roots of $\mathfrak{k}$.

Remark 3.2. From Harish-Chandra's volume formula, one may calculate the volume $\mathrm{vol}(K)$ for a compact connected Lie group K whenever one finds the volume $\mathrm{vol}(T)$ of the maximal torus T of K and all positive roots for $\mathfrak{k}$, assuming that K/T is endowed with the quotient measure. Indeed, we have

$$\mathrm{vol}(K) = \mathrm{vol}(T) \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}^+} \frac{2\pi}{\langle \alpha, \varpi \rangle}. \tag{3.5}$$

Example 3.3. In the present example, we want to calculate the volume of the flag manifold $\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}$ where $T_{(n)} \cong \mathrm{U}(1)^{\times n}$ is the maximal torus of unitary group $\mathrm{U}(n)$. It suffices to find all positive roots for $\mathfrak{u}(n)$. The set of all positive roots of $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ is given by

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}^+ = \left\{ \alpha_{ij} \in \mathfrak{t}_{(n)}^* : \alpha_{ij}(X) = x_i - x_j \text{ for any } X = \mathrm{diag}(x_1, \ldots, x_n),\ i < j \right\}.$$

We can view a diagonal matrix X as a real vector $X = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. In turn, we may view α_{ij} as the real vector

$$\alpha_{ij} = (\cdots \overbrace{1}^{i} \cdots \overbrace{-1}^{j} \cdots) \quad (1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n),$$

where $\cdot$ stands for zeroes, so that we have $\alpha_{ij}(X) = \langle \alpha_{ij}, X \rangle$. Then

$$\varpi = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i<j} \alpha_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(n-1, n-3, \ldots, 3-n, 1-n).$$

Let $\{e_j : j = 1, \ldots, n\}$ be the standard orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\alpha_{ij} = e_i - e_j$ and $\varpi = \sum_j \left(\frac{n+1}{2} - j \right) e_j$. So $\langle \alpha_{ij}, \varpi \rangle = \varpi_i - \varpi_j = \left(\frac{n+1}{2} - i \right) - \left(\frac{n+1}{2} - j \right) = j - i$. We also have $\langle \alpha_{ij}, \lambda \rangle = \lambda_i - \lambda_j$. Then, by Eq. (3.4),

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)} \right) = \prod_{i<j} \frac{2\pi}{\langle \alpha_{ij}, \varpi \rangle} = \prod_{i<j} \frac{2\pi}{j-i} = \frac{(2\pi)^{\binom{n}{2}}}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} \Gamma(j)}. \tag{3.6}$$

Since

$$\mathrm{vol}(T_{(n)}) = \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(1))^n = (2\pi)^n, \tag{3.7}$$

we have

$$\mathrm{vol}_{\mathrm{HS}}(\mathrm{U}(n)) = \frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} \Gamma(j)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Concerning the volume of unitary groups and orthogonal groups, we have given a comprehensive treatment in more elementary approach in [17].

Let $\Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}$ denote the set of roots of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(m)$. For each $\alpha^{(m)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}$, denote its associated root space by $\mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha^{(m)}}$. Let $\tau_m(\cdot) := \frac{1}{m} \mathrm{Tr}\,(\cdot)$ be the normalized trace form on the $m \times m$ matrices so that $\tau_m(\mathbb{1}_m) = 1$. For any $\alpha^{(m)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}$, the tensor product $\alpha^{(m)} \otimes \tau_n$ is a purely imaginary-valued $\mathbb{R}$-linear map $\mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n \to \mathbb{C}$. Extend, by zero, the domain of $\alpha^{(m)} \otimes \tau_n$ to $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n)}$ (recall that the intersection $(\mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n) \cap (\mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n)}) = \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_n$, and on such intersection, $\alpha^{(m)} \otimes \tau_n$ yields the value 0 because $\alpha^{(m)}$ depends only on the differences in the diagonal entries). We denote this extension by $\tilde{\alpha}^{(m)} = \alpha^{(m)} \otimes \tau_n$. Symmetrically, for each root $\alpha^{(n)}$ of $\mathfrak{u}(n)$, we denote by $\tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}$ the purely imaginary-valued $\mathbb{R}$-linear map $\mathfrak{t} \to \mathbb{C}$ obtained by extending $\tau_m \otimes \alpha^{(n)}$ by zero.

Proposition 3.4. *Denote* $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} = \left\{ \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)} \mid \alpha^{(m)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} \right\}$ *and* $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} = \left\{ \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)} \mid \alpha^{(n)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\}$. *Their disjoint union yields the set of roots for* $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{u}(m) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)$*:*

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}} = \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} \bigsqcup \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}. \tag{3.9}$$

The root space associated with $\tilde{\alpha}^{(m)} \in \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}$ *is* $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}(m) := \mathfrak{u}(m) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n$. *The root space associated with* $\tilde{\alpha}^{(n)} \in \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}$ *is* $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}(n) := \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)$.

Proof. Take the root space decompositions

$$\mathfrak{u}(m)_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{t}_{(m),\mathbb{C}} \oplus \bigoplus_{i \neq j}^{m} \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)},\mathbb{C}}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\mathfrak{u}(n)_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{t}_{(n),\mathbb{C}} \oplus \bigoplus_{k \neq l}^{n} \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha_{kl}^{(n)},\mathbb{C}}. \tag{3.11}$$

Here, $\mathfrak{u}(p)_{\mathbb{C}}$ ($p = m$ or n) denotes the complexification of $\mathfrak{u}(p)$. Then,

$$\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\mathbb{C}} \tag{3.12}$$

$$= \left(\mathfrak{t}_{(m),\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n),\mathbb{C}}\right) + \left(\bigoplus_{i\neq j}^{m} \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n\right) + \left(\bigoplus_{k\neq l}^{n} \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha_{kl}^{(n)}}\right). \tag{3.13}$$

We need to show that $\bigoplus_{i\neq j}^{m} \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n$'s and $\bigoplus_{k\neq l}^{n} \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha_{kl}^{(n)}}$'s are root spaces for $\mathfrak{k}$. Take an arbitrary vector $Z \in \mathfrak{t}_{(m),\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n),\mathbb{C}}$; then

$$Z = X \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes Y$$

for some $X \in \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\mathbb{C}}$. Observe that

$$[Z, \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n] = [X, \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)}}] \otimes \mathbb{1}_n = \alpha_{ij}^{(m)}(X)(\mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n). \tag{3.14}$$

So $\mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha_{ij}^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n$ is indeed a root space for $\mathfrak{k}$. Similar argument proves that each $\mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha_{kl}^{(n)}}$ is a root space for $\mathfrak{k}$.

We have demonstrated so far that $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}} = \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} \cup \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}$. To show that this is a disjoint union, we claim that, for any pair $(\alpha^{(m)}, \alpha^{(n)}) \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} \times \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}$, the two root spaces $\mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n$ and $\mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha^{(n)}}$ are distinct. Since root spaces are 1-dimensional, our claim is equivalent to saying that

$$\left(\mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha^{(m)}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n\right) \cap \left(\mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha^{(n)}}\right) = \{0\}. \tag{3.15}$$

The argument goes as follows: Say $X \in \mathfrak{u}(m)_{\alpha^{(m)}}$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{u}(n)_{\alpha^{(n)}}$. As root vectors, the nonzero entries of X and Y are all off-diagonal. Now suppose $X \otimes \mathbb{1}_n = \mathbb{1}_m \otimes Y$. Because all diagonal entries of both X and Y are zero, then it is easy to see that both X and Y are zero matrices. This completes the proof. □

With the above Proposition 3.4, one may calculate the volume $\mathrm{vol}(K)$ theoretically for $K = \mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)$ using Harish-Chandra's volume formula:

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)) = \mathrm{vol}(T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}) \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}^{+}} \frac{2\pi}{\langle \alpha, \varpi \rangle} \tag{3.16}$$

$$= (2\pi)^{m+n-1} \prod_{\alpha^{(m)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}^{+}} \frac{2\pi}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} \prod_{\alpha^{(n)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}^{+}} \frac{2\pi}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} \tag{3.17}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathfrak{k}}^{+}$ is the set of all positive roots for $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{u}(m) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n)$. Note that

$$\mathrm{vol}(T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}) = (2\pi)^{m+n-1} \tag{3.18}$$

since $\dim(\mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n)}) = m + n - 1$. Now

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{ij}^{(m)}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle = \left\langle \alpha_{ij}^{(m)} \otimes \tau_n, \varpi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} \otimes \tau_n \right\rangle + \left\langle \alpha_{ij}^{(m)} \otimes \tau_n, \tau_m \otimes \varpi_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle$$
$$= \left\langle \alpha_{ij}^{(m)}, \varpi_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} \right\rangle \langle \tau_n, \tau_n \rangle + \left\langle \alpha_{ij}^{(m)}, \tau_m \right\rangle \left\langle \tau_n, \varpi_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle,$$

that is,

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{ij}^{(m)}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle = \frac{j-i}{n}. \tag{3.19}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{kl}^{(n)}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle = \frac{l-k}{m}. \tag{3.20}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\alpha^{(m)} \in \Phi^+_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}} \frac{2\pi}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} &= \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m} \frac{2\pi}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{ij}^{(m)}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} & (3.21) \\ &= \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m} \frac{2n\pi}{j-i} = n^{\binom{m}{2}} \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(m)/T_{(m)}) & (3.22) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\alpha^{(n)} \in \Phi^+_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}} \frac{2\pi}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} &= \prod_{1 \leqslant k < l \leqslant n} \frac{2\pi}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{kl}^{(n)}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} & (3.23) \\ &= \prod_{1 \leqslant k < l \leqslant n} \frac{2m\pi}{l-k} = m^{\binom{n}{2}} \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}). & (3.24) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can draw the following conclusion:

Theorem 3.5. *For $m, n \geqslant 2$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}\right) &= m^{\binom{n}{2}} n^{\binom{m}{2}} \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{U}(m)/T_{(m)}\right) \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{U}(n)/T_{(n)}\right) & (3.25) \\ &= m^{\binom{n}{2}} n^{\binom{m}{2}} \frac{(2\pi)^{\binom{m}{2}+\binom{n}{2}}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \Gamma(i) \prod_{j=1}^n \Gamma(j)}. & (3.26) \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, with

$$\mathrm{vol}(T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}) = (2\pi)^{m+n-1}, \tag{3.27}$$

we have

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)\right) = m^{\binom{n}{2}} n^{\binom{m}{2}} \frac{(2\pi)^{\binom{m+1}{2}+\binom{n+1}{2}-1}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \Gamma(i) \prod_{j=1}^n \Gamma(j)}. \tag{3.28}$$

In particular, for $(m, n) = (2, 2)$, we have

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{U}(2) \otimes \mathrm{U}(2)\right) = 128\pi^5. \tag{3.29}$$

Proposition 3.6 ([3])**.** *Let K be a compact, connected Lie group of which T is a maximal torus. Let λ be a regular point in $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}^*_{>0}$. $\mathcal{O}_{K,\lambda}$ is a coadjoint orbit through λ. Then*

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{O}_{K,\lambda}) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+_{\mathfrak{k}}} \frac{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \varpi, \alpha \rangle}. \tag{3.30}$$

Here $\varpi = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+_{\mathfrak{k}}} \alpha$.

Example 3.7. Consider the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(n)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\lambda_1 > \cdots > \lambda_n$. The Hilbert-Schmidt inner product gives the identification of $\mathfrak{iu}(n)^*$ and $\mathfrak{iu}(n)$. Adjoint and coadjoint orbits of compact Lie

groups $\mathrm{U}(n)$ can be identified, using any $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathrm{U}(n))$-invariant inner product on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(n)$. In the following, we calculate the volume of an adjoint orbit $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathrm{U}(n))\Lambda$ for $\Lambda \in \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}$ where $\mathfrak{t}$ is the maximal torus of diagonal matrices from $\mathfrak{iu}(n)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{O}_\Lambda = \mathrm{Ad}(\mathrm{U}(n))\Lambda = \{U\Lambda U^* : \Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \text{ with } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } \lambda_1 > \cdots > \lambda_n\}.$$

Continuing with the description of the positive roots of $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ given in Ex. 3.3, we have, by Eq. (3.30),

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{Ad}(\mathrm{U}(n))\Lambda\right) = \prod_{i<j} \frac{\langle \alpha_{ij}, \lambda \rangle}{\langle \alpha_{ij}, \varpi \rangle} = \prod_{i<j} \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_j}{j-i} = \frac{\prod_{i<j}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)}{1! \cdots (n-1)!}. \tag{3.31}$$

That is,

$$\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{O}_\Lambda) = \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathrm{Ad}(\mathrm{U}(n))\Lambda\right) = \frac{\prod_{i<j}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^n \Gamma(j)} = \frac{|\Delta(\lambda)|}{\prod_{j=1}^n \Gamma(j)}, \tag{3.32}$$

where $\Delta(\lambda) = \prod_{i<j}(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $K = \mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)$. Denote its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ by*

$$\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{u}(m) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{u}(n). \tag{3.33}$$

Moreover, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of the maximal torus $T = T_{(m)} \otimes T_{(n)}$ of K is denoted by

$$\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_{(m)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{(n)}. \tag{3.34}$$

Denote $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_{11}, \ldots, \lambda_{m1}, \ldots, \lambda_{1n}, \ldots, \lambda_{mn})$ where $\lambda_{11} > \ldots > \lambda_{mn}$. It is a regular point in a maximal torus algebra $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_{(mn)}$ of $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{u}(mn)$. Now let $\lambda \in \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_{>0}$ be a regular point derived from Λ, i.e., $\lambda = \mathrm{Tr}_n(\Lambda) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n + \mathbb{1}_m \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_m(\Lambda)$, then it holds that

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{K,\lambda}\right) = \frac{\left[\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{jk}\right)\right] \left[\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{il}\right)\right]}{\prod_{i=1}^m \Gamma(i) \prod_{k=1}^n \Gamma(k)}. \tag{3.35}$$

Proof. In fact, using the obtained positive roots for $\mathfrak{k}$, we have

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{K,\lambda}\right) = \prod_{\alpha^{(m)} \in \Phi^+_{\mathfrak{u}(m)}} \frac{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}, \lambda \right\rangle}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} \prod_{\alpha^{(n)} \in \Phi^+_{\mathfrak{u}(n)}} \frac{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}, \lambda \right\rangle}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle}. \tag{3.36}$$

That is,

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{K,\lambda}\right) = \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m} \frac{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}_{ij}, \lambda \right\rangle}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}_{ij}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle} \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}_{kl}, \lambda \right\rangle}{\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}_{kl}, \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(m)} + \widetilde{\varpi}_{\mathfrak{u}(n)} \right\rangle}. \tag{3.37}$$

Since

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(m)}_{ij}, \lambda \right\rangle = \left\langle \alpha^{(m)}_{ij} \otimes \tau_n, \lambda \right\rangle = \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{Tr}\left(((E_{ii} - E_{jj}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_n)\Lambda\right) = \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{Tr}\left((E_{ii} - E_{jj})\,\mathrm{Tr}_n(\Lambda)\right) \tag{3.38}$$

and

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}^{(n)}_{kl}, \lambda \right\rangle = \left\langle \tau_m \otimes \alpha^{(n)}_{kl}, \lambda \right\rangle = \frac{1}{m} \mathrm{Tr}\left((\mathbb{1}_m \otimes (E_{kk} - E_{ll}))\Lambda\right) = \frac{1}{m} \mathrm{Tr}\left((E_{kk} - E_{ll})\,\mathrm{Tr}_m(\Lambda)\right) \tag{3.39}$$

it follows that

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{ij}^{(m)}, \lambda \right\rangle = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{jk} \right) \tag{3.40}$$

and

$$\left\langle \tilde{\alpha}_{kl}^{(n)}, \lambda \right\rangle = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{il} \right). \tag{3.41}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{K,\lambda}\right) &= \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m} \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{jk} \right)}{\frac{1}{n}(j-i)} \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} \frac{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{il} \right)}{\frac{1}{m}(l-k)} && (3.42) \\ &= \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{jk} \right)}{j-i} \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\lambda_{ik} - \lambda_{il} \right)}{l-k}. && (3.43) \end{aligned}$$

The proof is done. □

Essentially, Theorem 3.8 give a formula for the volume of local unitary orbit of product form, i.e., $\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mu\otimes\nu}\right) = \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mu}\right)\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\nu}\right)$, where $\mu \in \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_{(m)}$ and $\nu \in \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_{(n)}$.

Corollary 3.9. *Assume that the local unitary orbit, of a generic probability distribution* $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ *where* $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3 > \lambda_4 \geqslant 0$ *with* $\sum_{j=1}^{4} \lambda_j = 1$, *is denoted by*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}} := \left\{ (U \otimes V)\Lambda(U^{-1} \otimes V^{-1}) : U, V \in \mathrm{U}(2) \right\}.$$

Then the Riemannian volume of such local unitary orbit is given by

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}\right) = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_4). \tag{3.44}$$

Proof. It is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.8. □

Remark 3.10. With the notations in Corollary 3.9, denote

$$\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}} := \left\{ W\Lambda W^{-1} : W \in \mathrm{U}(4) \right\}. \tag{3.45}$$

From Eq. (3.32), we have

$$\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}\right) = \frac{1}{12} \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant 4} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j). \tag{3.46}$$

Meanwhile, with the restriction $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3 > \lambda_4 \geqslant 0$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{4} \lambda_j = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}\right) = [(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)][(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) + (\lambda_3 - \lambda_4)] \\ &> 4\sqrt{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_4)} \\ &> 4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_4) \\ &> 4 \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant 4} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) > 48\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}\right) > \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

So we see that $\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}\right) < \mathrm{vol}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}\right)$, and apparently $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}$ is a submanifold of $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}$ since $\mathrm{U}(2) \otimes \mathrm{U}(2)$ is a Lie subgroup of $\mathrm{U}(4)$. This is not a contradiction because the measures for $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}$ have no *a priori* relation, so one cannot directly compare the two. In fact, $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}$ is a set of zero-measure in $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}}$ since $\dim(\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{LU}}) < \dim(\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda}^{\mathrm{GU}})$.

4 Discussion and concluding remarks

We know that there may exist many Λ's corresponds to single one λ (see Theorem 3.8). Indeed, a relevant famous problem is the so-called quantum marginal problem; and for the two-qubit system there is a nice solution for it [4]. Specifically, mixed two-qubit state ρ_{AB} with spectrum $\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \lambda_3 \geqslant \lambda_4 \geqslant 0$ and margins ρ_A and ρ_B exists if and only if minimal eigenvalues λ_A, λ_B of the margins satisfy inequalities

$$\begin{cases} \min(\lambda_A, \lambda_B) \geqslant \lambda_3 + \lambda_4, \\ \lambda_A + \lambda_B \geqslant \lambda_2 + 2\lambda_3 + \lambda_4, \\ |\lambda_A - \lambda_B| \leqslant \min(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3, \lambda_2 - \lambda_4). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Here we present a specific example showing this property. Let ρ_{AB} be any two-qudit in $\mathrm{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$. Then there exists a global unitary $V \in \mathrm{U}(d^2)$ such that $\rho'_{AB} = V\rho_{AB}V^\dagger$ with two marginal states as $\rho'_A = \rho'_B = \mathbb{1}_d/d$. Indeed, by the Spectral Decomposition Theorem, we have the following decomposition: denoting $[k] := \{1, \ldots, k\}$ for any positive integer k,

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j |\Psi_j\rangle\langle\Psi_j|, \quad |\Psi_j\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\lambda_j \geqslant 0$ for each $j \in [d^2]$ and $\left\{|\Psi_j\rangle : j \in [d^2]\right\}$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalues λ_j. There exists a collection of unitary matrices, called *discrete Weyl unitary matrices*, $W_j \in \mathrm{U}(d) (j = 1, \ldots, d^2)$, that form a unitary matrix basis for $M_d(\mathbb{C})$, the set of all $d \times d$ complex matrices. Now $\left\{\mathrm{vec}(W_j) : j \in [d^2]\right\}$ is a maximally entangled basis for $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ (see also for its generalization in [7]). Note that the notation $\mathrm{vec}(M)$ is the vectorization of a complex rectangular matrix M, which is defined by $\mathrm{vec}(M) = \sum_{i,j} M_{ij}|ij\rangle$, where $M = \sum_{i,j} M_{ij}|i\rangle\langle j|$. Thus exists a global unitary matrix $V \in \mathrm{U}(d^2)$ such that

$$V|\Psi_j\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathrm{vec}(W_j) \quad , j = 1, \ldots, d^2 \tag{4.3}$$

since $\left\{|\Psi_j\rangle : j \in [d^2]\right\}$ and $\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathrm{vec}(W_j) : j \in [d^2]\right\}$ are two orthonormal basis for the same space $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. This means that

$$\rho'_{AB} = V\rho_{AB}V^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j V|\Psi_j\rangle\langle\Psi_j|V^\dagger = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j \mathrm{vec}(W_j)\,\mathrm{vec}(W_j)^\dagger. \tag{4.4}$$

Thus

$$\rho'_A = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j W_j W_j^\dagger = \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j = \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_{AB}\right) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\rho'_B = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j (W_j^\dagger W_j)^\intercal = \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \lambda_j = \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_{AB}\right) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}. \tag{4.6}$$

Therefore $\rho'_A = \rho'_B = \mathbb{1}_d/d$. This example also indicates that the maximum of mutual information along a global unitary orbit of a given bipartite state with the prescribed spectrum Λ is $2\ln(d) - S(\Lambda)$ [8, 9], where

$S(\Lambda)$ is the von Neumann entropy. Let ρ_A and ρ_B be fixed. Denote by $\mathcal{C}(\rho_A, \rho_B)$ the set of all bipartite states ρ_{AB} with fixed marginal states ρ_A and ρ_B, respectively. It is known that $\mathcal{C}(\rho_A, \rho_B)$ is a compact convex set. Moreover, a necessary and sufficient criterion is presented by Pathasarathy [15] for an element ρ_{AB} in $\mathcal{C}(\rho_A, \rho_B)$ to be an extreme point. In the two-qubit case, the extreme points of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{1}/2, \mathbb{1}/2)$ are characterized as well, namely, a two-qubit state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{1}/2, \mathbb{1}/2)$ is extreme if and only if it is maximally entangled state.

There are several *open* questions which are presented below:

1. Assume that both generic bipartite states ρ and ϱ are not LU equivalent, where ρ is locally diagonalizable and ϱ is not. As we see previously, the volume of $\mathcal{O}_\rho^{\mathrm{LU}}$ can be calculated, the question is how to calculate the volume of $\mathcal{O}_\varrho^{\mathrm{LU}}$?

2. It is easily seen that $\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)$ can be partitioned as local unitary orbits. That is,
$$\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n) = \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \Delta_{mn-1}} \mathcal{O}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{LU}}. \tag{4.7}$$
How do we get the volume $\mathrm{vol}\left(\mathscr{D}_{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^n)\right)$ from the volumes $\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{O}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{LU}})$ of local unitary orbits $\mathcal{O}_\Lambda^{\mathrm{LU}}$? This question is motivated by the fact that the whole set of the state space $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ can be partitioned as unitary orbits:
$$\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^n) = \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \Delta_{n-1}} \mathcal{O}_\Lambda. \tag{4.8}$$
We can get the volume $\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^n))$ through the volumes $\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{O}_\Lambda)$ in terms of Duistermaat-Heckman measure [5].

3. Can we establish some kind of "canonical form" for any bipartite state just like establishing Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) for any complex matrix and/or Spectral Decomposition for any normal matrix, especially for any two-qubit states? And how?

4. Because $\mathcal{C}(\rho_A, \rho_B)$ is a compact convex set, its volume can be calculated in theoretical. To the best of our knowledge, analytical expression for its volume is never found out. But, recently, we find that a formula is obtained for $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{1}/2, \mathbb{1}/2)$. That is, $\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{1}/2, \mathbb{1}/2)) = \frac{2\pi^4}{315}$ [11]. Here we identify $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{1}/2, \mathbb{1}/2)$ with the set of all unital qubit quantum channels via Choi-Jamiłkowski isomorphism. The problem about the calculation of the volume of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{1}/2, \mathbb{1}/2)$ is previously raised in [17].

In summary, we make an analysis of the geometry of locally diagonalizable states, and calculate its Hilbert-Schmidt volume. Theoretically, although we work out analytical formula for it, a specific value is just presented in the two-qubit situation. In addition, we have obtained the necessary and sufficient condition for two-qubit state being LU equivalent to a given diagonal form. But, however, the problem in a high dimensional space is still open. After introducing Harish-Chandra's volume formula for co-adjoint orbit, we turn to the geometry of local unitary orbits. We find that Harish-Chandra's volume formula can be applied to calculate the volume of local unitary orbits. As by-product, we get the volume formula of tensor product $\mathrm{U}(m) \otimes \mathrm{U}(n)$ as a compact Lie subgroup of the compact Lie group $\mathrm{U}(mn)$. Although this is a direct consequence of Harish-Chandra's volume formula, it is never given explicitly before. We believe these results obtained and questions raised in the paper can shed new lights and spur relevant researches in quantum information theory.

Acknowledgements

LZ is supported by Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province of China (LY17A010027) and by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11301124&No.61673145). SH was partially supported under Northwestern Scholarship Grant.

References

[1] A. Andai, *Volume of the quantum mechanical state space*, J. Phys. A : Math. Theor. **39**, 13641 (2006).

[2] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of quantum states: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement*, Cambridge University Press (2006).

[3] N. Berline, E. Getzler and M. Vergne, *Heat kernels and Dirac operators*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1992).

[4] S. Bravyi, *Compatibility between local and multipartite states*, Quant Inf. & Comput. 4(1), 012-026 (2004).

[5] M. Christandl, B. Doran, S. Kousidis, M. Walter, *Eigenvalue distributions of reduced density matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **332**, 1-52 (2014).

[6] J.J. Duistermaat, J.A.C Kolk, *Lie Groups*, Springer-Verlage New York, Inc. (2000).

[7] Y. Guo, S. Du, X. Li, and S. Wu, *Entangled bases with fixed Schmidt number*, J. Phys. A : Math. Theor. **48**, 245301 (2015).

[8] S. Jevtic, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, *Maximally and minimally correlated states attainable within a closed evolving system*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110403 (2012).

[9] S. Jevtic, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, *Quantum mutual information along unitary orbits*, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 052121 (2012).

[10] N. Jing, S-M. Fei, M. Li, X. Li-Jost, and T. Zhang, *Local unitary invariants of generic multiqubit states*, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022306 (2015).

[11] A. Lovas, A. Andai, *Volume of the space of qubit channels and some new results about the distribution of the quantum Dobrushin coefficient*, arXiv:1607.01215

[12] A. Lovas, A. Andai, *Invariance of separability probability over reduced states in* 4×4 *bipartite systems*, arXiv:1610.01410

[13] I.G. Macdonald, *The volume of a compact Lie group*, Invent. Math. **56**, 93-95 (1980).

[14] S. Milz and W.T. Strunz, *Volumes of conditioned bipartite state spaces*, J. Phys. A : Math. Theor. **48**, 035306 (2014).

[15] K.R. Pathasarathy, *Extremal quantum states in coupled systems*, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (B) Probability and Statistics **41**, 257-268 (2005).

[16] P.B. Slater and C.F. Dunkl, *Moment-based evidence for simple rational-valued Hilbert-Schmidt generic* 2×2 *separability probabilities*, J. Phys. A : Math. Theor. **45**, 095305(2012).

[17] L. Zhang, *Volumes of orthogonal groups and unitary groups*, arXiv:1509.00537

[18] K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, *Volume of the set of separable states*, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998).

[19] K. Życzkowski and I. Bengtsson, *On Duality between Quantum Maps and Quantum States*, Open Systems & Information Dynamics **11** 3-42 (2004).

[20] K. Życzkowski and H.J. Sommers, *Induced measures in the space of mixed quantum states*, J. Phys. A : Math. Gen. **34**, 7111 (2001).

[21] K. Życzkowski and H.J. Sommers, *Hilbert-Schmidt volume of the set of mixed quantum states*, J. Phys. A : Math. Gen. **36**, 10115 (2003).